Meeting Minutes  
NFCR 1W1P Policy Committee Meeting  
10:30 am – 1:00 pm, Wednesday, January 3, 2018  
Meeker County Government Center, Litchfield, MN

**Attendance:** Chuck Uphoff, Stearns SWCD; Doug Hanson, Kandiyohi SWCD; Roger Imdieke, Kandiyohi County; Bob Brauchler, NFCRWD; Bruce Wing, MFCRWD; Randy Pederson, Pope SWCD; Chris Uecker, Wright SWCD; Jeff Mergen, Stearns County; Mike Housman, Meeker County; Tom Petersen, CROW; Rachel Olm, Houston Engineering Inc. (HEI); Nicole Erickson, CROW; Steve Christopher, BWSR; Diane Sander, CROW; Chris Skonard, NFCRWD; Margaret Johnson, MFCRWD; Ethan Jenzen, DNR; and Randy Kramer, Renville County.

**Meeting Summary:**
- January 3, 2018 Agenda approved; November 1, 2017 PC Meeting Minutes approved as amended; December 20, 2017 PWG/AC meeting notes reviewed.
- Review and Approve Section 4.
- Review and Approve Section 5.
- Review and Approve Sections 1 thru 5.
- Approved the 14 LGUs to start the 60-Day Review Process.
- Approved the recommendation that the 14 LGUs consider joint public hearings.

**Call to Order:** Meeting called to order by Chair Housman at 10:35 am.

**Review and Approve Agenda and Minutes**
Review and approval of January 3, 2018 PC meeting Agenda; November 1, 2017 1W1P Policy Committee (PC) Minutes; review of December 20, 2017 1W1P PWG/AC Meeting Notes. Lines 84 and 85 of the draft minutes were amended to reflect that three capital improvements are listed for the Plan’s 10 year duration.
Motion to approve the January 3rd Agenda and November 1, 2017 Minutes as amended by Chuck Uphoff, second by Roger Imdieke. Motion passed.

**Plan Status Update**
Rachel, HEI provided a brief status update on where we are in the planning process. She reported that all five sections of the draft plan are written and subject to approval by the PC at today’s meeting. The plan is currently undergoing an intense review by HEI staff for formatting and grammar before formal publication as the official draft for the 60 day public review process, along with any additions to text as discussed at today’s meeting. Rachel also reported that the Appendices (waiting on the public comments) will be added and that the PTMAp “Treatment Trains” data for inclusion in the final plan will be added at a later date (early February, hopefully).

**Overview and review of Section 4**
Rachel provided overview of the section and review of the priority issues shown on Table 4.1. Mike asked about the color coding. To eliminate confusion, Rachel will add a footnote regarding the color coding and explain that the issues are not listed in priority order.

Table 4.4 was reviewed, showing and discussing Implementation Profiles for the 7 Planning Regions. The profile for the MFCR Planning Region was discussed and reviewed as an example. Mike noted that in review of all the 7 Implementation Profiles, it appeared that infiltration and storage practices seem to be the most cost-effective BMPs. It was noted that costs as reflected in this section are not “indexed” for inflation over the 10 year life-span of the plan. It was further stated that specific locations for BMPs can be determined by local government units by review of PTMAp database. Rachel reminded the group that management practices are discussed in the Rural Stewardship section/goals of the plan.

Table 4.8 Rachel discussed “baseline funding” and the calculated cost to achieve the State water quality goals as reflected in the plan. Discussion followed regarding BWSR’s funding for implementation of pilot 1W1P and apparent funding disparities between metro area and rural area watershed plans. Rachel reminded the group that each Planning Region is a stand-alone entity. Chuck indicated that based on projected costs and the proposed grant funding levels by BWSR, it may be impossible to achieve our goals. The three levels of funding were reviewed. Much extemporaneous discussion ensued, by PC members on the needed funding. It was pointed out by Roger that the baseline funding is the best estimate of current funding. BWSR staff was asked why the metro is proposed to get more funding for watershed plan...
implementation then rural MN. Staff reported that BWSR did not want to flood the area with money and overwhelm staff capacity and work load. Motion to approve Section 4 by Roger Imdieke, second by Chuck Uphoff. Motion passed.

**Overview and Review of Section 5**
Rachel provided a summary of this section. The Board was reminded that they have already seen a great deal of the content for this section. Rachel stated that the language of this section has not been changed much since earlier discussions by the PC. The Funding Table 5.5 was reviewed. Mike stated that Table 5.3, Statutory Obligations does not look right to him, it appears that Meeker County is not accurately reflected. The question was asked... is it worth updating before public review? It was determined that all member organizations will have one last opportunity to review and update the information for this table. Mike asked if the three CIP’s listed were determined by the same process the other BMPs were determined? The answer is no. They are projects as determined by the two watershed districts and have no connection to the identified BMPs per the PTMApp model. Mike asked BWSR staff if the current block grant to the County is going to change due to 1W1P. Steve said no, but it could be rolled into the new grant.

Chuck reviewed Table 5.6 and commented that MN Dept. Agriculture funding for Agriculture Certification be added to this table. Motion to approve Section 5 by Roger Imdieke, second by Chuck Uphoff. Motion passed.

Rachel noted the Appendices and Treatment Train data will be added to the plan latter in the review process. BWSR staff indicated that the 60 Day review process could start without this information as it will not change the operational content/implementation of the plan.

**Content of the Draft Plan**
Motion by Chuck Uphoff to approve content for the North Fork Crow River 1W1P Draft Plan, second by Doug Hanson. Motion passed.

**60-Day Review Process**
Steve explained the various review requirements that must take place before BWSR and the LGUs to adopt the plan. The first is a 60 day review, followed by a public hearing (no sooner than 14 days after the close of the 60-day review process), and followed by an up to 90-day State agency and BWSR approval process. Steve further advised the members that each of the 14 LGUs, must pass a motion to release the draft, as approved by the PC today, and authorize the review process. The announcement of the 60-day review must be published by the LGU according to its statutory requirements. Each board could delegate a PC to attend a joint public hearing. Steve also indicated the Public Hearing that must take place after the 60-day review process. He suggested that the LGUs consider holding “joint Public Hearing”. Motion made by Roger Imdieke, second by Chris Uecker to direct the individual LGU’s to authorize, advertise and proceed with the 60-Day Public Review Process of the Draft North Fork Crow River 1W1P Draft Plan on January 3, 2018. Motion passed.

BWSR/CROW staff will draft a cover letter with link to HEI ftp site for the public to access the draft plan.

The group discussed when the “Public Hearing(s)” should be held and the process necessary to advertise the date, time and location of the Public Hearing. Steve noted that given that each of the LGUs will advertise the start of the 60-day review process at different dates, the CROW, in concert with the LGUs will need to determine a date(s) to hold the Public Hearing(s) at a later time once all LGUs have posted the 60-day review. The possibility of joint public hearings was further discussed. Motion of a recommendation from the Policy Committee to the 14 LGUs to consider holding joint Public Hearings once the 60-day review process has been completed by Roger Imdieke, second by Chris Uecker. Motion passed.

Motion to adjourn was made by Randy Pederson, second by Chris Uecker. Motion passed.

Meeting adjourned at 12:10 pm